arXiv:1305.1103v1 [hep-th] 6 May 2013

USTC-ICTS-13-08

Dijkgraaf-Vafa conjecture and β-deformed matrix models

Min-xin Huang *

∗ *Interdisciplinary Center for Theoretical Study,*
University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China

Abstract

We study the β-deformed matrix models using the method of refined topological string theory. The refined holomorphic anomaly equation and boundary conditions near the singular divisors of the underlying geometry fix the refined amplitudes recursively. We provide exact test of the quantum integrality conjecture in the Nekrasov-Shatashvili limit. We check the higher genus exact formulae with perturbative matrix model calculations.

---

*minxin@ustc.edu.cn

Contents

1 Introduction and Summary 1

2 Perturbative calculations 1

3 Review of Dijkgraaf-Vafa geometry 5

4 Genus one formulae 7

5 Higher genus 8

References 10

1 Introduction and Summary

Recently there have been some interests in refined topological string theory, which originate from the Ω deformation in supersymmetric gauge theory [24]. It is expected that the Dijkgraaf-Vafa conjecture [8], which relates matrix models with topological strings on certain local Calabi-Yau manifolds, can be generalized to the refined case. Here the refinement will correspond to the β-deformation of the matrix models. The topological expansion of ordinary matrix model free energy has been constructed from the spectral curves [2, 10], and can be generalized to the β-deformed case [6, 7]. However, the topological recursion method is still too difficult for many practical calculations in the β-deformed case, see e.g. [4, 20]. Furthermore, the holomorphic anomaly equation can be derived from the topological recursion in the undeformed case [9]. For the β-deformed case such a derivation is not available at the moment in the literature. In this paper, we shall study the simple example of β-deformed cubic matrix model. Continuing in the direction of previous works [14, 16, 1], we provide some higher genus formulae from the refined topological string method of holomorphic anomaly equation and the gap boundary conditions near singular divisors [3, 18, 15].

2 Perturbative calculations

The partition function Z and free energy F of a Hermitian matrix model with polynomial potential $W(\Phi)$ is defined by

$$Z = e^F = \frac{1}{\mathrm{Vol}(U(N))}\int D\Phi e^{-\frac{\mathrm{tr}W(\Phi)}{g_s}} = \frac{1}{N!(2\pi)^N}\int (\prod_i d\lambda_i)\Delta^2(\lambda) e^{-\sum_i \frac{W(\lambda_i)}{g_s}}, \qquad (2.1)$$

where g_s is a perturbative expansion parameter, λ_i $(i = 1, 2\cdots, N)$ are the eigenvalues of the Hermitian matrix Φ, and $\Delta(\lambda) = \prod_{i<j}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)$ is the well known Vandermonde determinant. The β-deformation replaces the matrix integrand by its β power, so the

partition function becomes

$$Z(\beta) = e^{F(\beta)} = \frac{1}{N!(2\pi)^N} \int (\prod_i d\lambda_i) \Delta^{2\beta}(\lambda) e^{-\frac{\beta}{g_s}\sum_i W(\lambda_i)}. \tag{2.2}$$

In this paper we mostly consider a cubic polynomial potential

$$W(\Phi) = \frac{1}{2}\Phi^2 + \frac{1}{3}\Phi^3. \tag{2.3}$$

We can compute the free energy perturbatively for small g_s, by expanding the exponential and reduce the computation to the expectation values of multi-trace operators in Gaussian matrix model. For the correspondence with Dijkgraaf-Vafa conjecture and topological string theory, we consider two-cut solution of the matrix model in the large N limit. The eigenvalues of the matrix Φ distribute continuously around the two extrema of the potential (2.3). Here one of the extrema is actually a local maximum, so we need to use an analytic continuation to anti-Hermitian matrix, so that the expansion around the local maximum is the usual Gaussian matrix model.

The perturbative calculations in the case without β-deformation, i.e. $\beta = 1$, were studied in details in [17]. The idea is similar in the β-deformed case, and the partition function of the two-cut solution can be written as a two-matrix model

$$Z = \frac{1}{N_1!(2\pi)^{N_1} N_2!(2\pi)^{N_2}} \int (\prod_{i=1}^{N_1} d\mu_i) \Delta^{2\beta}(\mu) (\prod_{i=1}^{N_2} d\nu_i) \Delta^{2\beta}(\nu) e^{-W_1(\Phi_1) - W_2(\Phi_2) - W(\Phi_1,\Phi_2)}, \tag{2.4}$$

where μ_i and ν_j are the eigenvalues of the two Hermitian matrices Φ_1, Φ_2, and the potentials are

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(\Phi_1) &= \mathrm{tr}[\frac{1}{2}\Phi_1^2 + \frac{1}{3}(\frac{g_s}{\beta})^{\frac{1}{2}}\Phi_1^3], \\ W_2(\Phi_2) &= -\mathrm{tr}[\frac{1}{2}\Phi_2^2 - \frac{1}{3}(\frac{g_s}{\beta})^{\frac{1}{2}}\Phi_2^3], \\ W(\Phi_1, \Phi_2) &= \frac{\beta N_2}{6g_s} - \beta N_1 N_2 \log(\frac{g_s}{\beta}) \\ &\quad +2\beta \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k}(\frac{g_s}{\beta})^{\frac{k}{2}} \sum_{p=0}^{k} (-1)^p \binom{k}{p} \mathrm{tr}(\Phi_1^p)\mathrm{tr}(\Phi_2^{k-p}). \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Here the interaction term comes the exponentiation of the interaction of the eigenvalues μ_i and ν_j in the Vandermonde determinant. We have rescale the matrices Φ_1 and Φ_2 by a factor $(\frac{g_s}{\beta})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ to normalize the Gaussian potential, and neglect the unimportant overall factor in the partition function from the scaling.

The correlators of multi-trace operators can be computed recursively by the loop equation of the β-deformed matrix model [22, 23]. Denote the correlators

$$C_{k_1,k_2,\cdots,k_m}(N,\beta) = \frac{\int D_\beta \Phi \mathrm{tr}(\Phi^{k_1})\mathrm{tr}(\Phi^{k_2})\cdots\mathrm{tr}(\Phi^{k_m})\exp(-\frac{\mathrm{tr}\Phi^2}{2})}{\int D_\beta \Phi \exp(-\frac{\mathrm{tr}\Phi^2}{2})}, \tag{2.6}$$

where Φ is a $N\times N$ Hermitian matrix, and the β-deformed measure is $D_\beta\Phi \sim (\prod_i d\lambda_i)\Delta^{2\beta}(\lambda)$. Here the indices k_i are non-negative integers and the correlator is understood to be zero by convention if one of the indices is negative. For the cases of odd $\sum_{i=1}^m k_i$, the correlators vanish due to the reflection symmetry of the Gaussian potential. Also obvious is the situation of one the indices $k_i=0$, where we can simply pull out a N factor since $\mathrm{tr}(1)=N$. The loop equation, which is the Ward identity of matrix model, provide the following recursion relation for the correlators

$$\begin{aligned} C_{k_1,k_2,\cdots,k_m} &= \beta\sum_{i=0}^{k_m-2} C_{k_1,\cdots,k_{m-1},i,k_m-2-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} k_i C_{k_1,\cdots,k_i+k_m-2,\cdots,k_{m-1}} \\ &\quad +(1-\beta)(k_m-1)C_{k_1,\cdots,k_{m-1},k_m-2}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

Here the index k_m for the recursion should be strictly positive $k_m>0$. For the undeformed case $\beta=1$, the above recursion can be easily understood from the Feynman rule of m vertices, where a line of the last vertex can be contracted with another line from itself or a line from another vertex. From the recursion relation (2.7) and the initial conditions $C_0=N$, one can then compute the correlators recursively [23].

We would like to obtain the genus expansion of the free energy. It turns out that there is a nice shift of the t'Hooft parameters so that the odd terms in the expansion vanish [1]. This is similar to the shift of mass parameters $m_i \to m_i + \frac{\epsilon_1+\epsilon_2}{2}$ in Seiberg-Witten theory studied in [19, 13].

There are two contributions to the free energy, known as the non-perturbative part and the perturbative part. The non-perturbative contributions come from the measure of the matrix integral and the $U(N)$ volume factor [26], which is obtained by evaluating the partition function (2.4), without the interaction term $W(\Phi_1,\Phi_2)$ and setting $g_s=0$. The case of β deformation is computed in [4]. Up to an unimportant constant from the analytic continuation to Gaussian potential $\Phi_2\to i\Phi_2$, the result is

$$\begin{aligned} F_{n.p.} &= \sum_{i=1}^{2}\Big[\frac{\beta^2t_i^2}{2}(\log(t_i)-\frac{3}{2})g_s^{-2} + \frac{\beta-1}{2}(\log(\beta t_i)-1)t_i g_s^{-1} \\ &\quad +\frac{1-3\beta+\beta^2}{12\beta}\log(\beta t_i) + \frac{1-\beta}{24\beta t_i}g_s + \frac{1-5\beta^2+\beta^4}{720\beta^3 t_i^2}g_s^2 + \mathcal{O}(g_s^3)\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

where the t'Hooft parameters are defined as

$$t_i = g_s N_i, \qquad i=1,2. \tag{2.9}$$

We see naively there are odd g_s power terms in (2.8). In refined topological string theory, the free energy comes from the effective action of integrating out charged BPS particles in graviphoton background, and as such only even power terms appear. The situation is remedied by a shift

$$t_i \to t_i - \frac{\beta-1}{2\beta}g_s, \quad i=1,2. \tag{2.10}$$

The shift cancels the odd power terms in the non-perturbative contribution (2.8). We use the calligraphic symbol to denote the free energy after the shift

$$\mathcal{F}_{n.p.} = \sum_{i=1}^{2}[(\frac{\log t_i}{2} - \frac{3}{4})\frac{\beta t_i^2}{g_s^2} - \frac{\beta^2+1}{24\beta}\log(t_i) - \frac{7\beta^4+10\beta^2+7}{5760\beta^3}\frac{g_s^2}{t_i^2} + \mathcal{O}(g_s^4)]. \tag{2.11}$$

Next we compute the perturbative contributions. We can neglect the unimportant terms in the first line in $W(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ in (2.5), and keep the contributions that are perturbative for small g_s. We expand the remaining exponents in (2.4), and use the recursion (2.7). We find the first few terms

$$\begin{aligned} F_{pert} \;=\;& (N_1 - N_2)[2\beta^2(2N_1^2 - 13N_1N_2 + 2N_2^2) - 9\beta(\beta-1)(N_1+N_2) + (5\beta^2 - 9\beta + 5)]\frac{g_s}{6\beta} \\ &+[2\beta^3(8N_1^4 - 91N_1^3N_2 + 177N_1^2N_2^2 - 91N_1N_2^3 + 8N_2^4) - \beta^2(\beta-1)(59N_1^3 - 81N_1^2N_2 \\ &-81N_1N_2^2 + 59N_2^3) + \beta(73\beta^2 - 132\beta + 73)(N_1^2 + N_2^2) - 2\beta(92\beta^2 - 153\beta + 92)N_1N_2 \\ &-(\beta-1)(30\beta^2 - 43\beta + 30)(N_1+N_2)]\frac{g_s^2}{6\beta^2} + \mathcal{O}(g_s^3). \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

Again we find that the shift (2.10) eliminates the odd g_s power terms in the perturbative free energy. Putting the non-perturbative and perturbative contributions (after the shift) together, we can extracted the higher genus refined amplitudes $\mathcal{F}^{(n,g)}$ by the expansion

$$\mathcal{F}_{n.p.} + \mathcal{F}_{pert} = \sum_{n,g=0}^{\infty} g_s^{2(n+g)-2}\beta^{1-g-2n}(\beta-1)^{2n}\mathcal{F}^{(n,g)}(t_1,t_2). \tag{2.13}$$

We list the first few refined topological amplitudes. Here the unrefined cases of $F^{(0,g)}$ have been computed in [17], and for completeness we also display them here.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^{(0,0)} \;=\;& \sum_{i=1}^{2}(\frac{t_i^2\log t_i}{2} - \frac{3t_i^2}{4}) + (\frac{2}{3}t_1^3 - 5t_1^2t_2 + 5t_1t_2^2 - \frac{2}{3}t_2^3) + \frac{1}{3}(8t_1^4 - 91t_1^3t_2 \\ &+177t_1^2t_2^2 - 91t_1t_2^3 + 8t_2^4) + \mathcal{O}(t^5), \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^{(1,0)} \;=\;& -\sum_{i=1}^{2}\frac{\log t_i}{24} + \frac{19}{12}(t_1 - t_2) + \frac{1}{6}(97t_1^2 - 265t_1t_2 + 97t_2^2) \\ &+\frac{1}{18}(4004t_1^3 - 19401t_1^2t_2 + 19401t_1t_2^2 - 4004t_2^3) + \mathcal{O}(t^4), \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^{(0,1)} \;=\;& -\sum_{i=1}^{2}\frac{\log t_i}{12} + \frac{1}{6}(t_1 - t_2) + \frac{1}{3}(7t_1^2 - 31t_1t_2 + 7t_2^2) \\ &+\frac{1}{9}(332t_1^3 - 2769t_1^2t_2 + 2769t_1t_2^2 - 332t_2^3) + \mathcal{O}(t^4) \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^{(2,0)} \;=\;& -\sum_{i=1}^{2}\frac{7}{5760t_i^2} + \frac{131}{48} + \frac{22709}{144}(t_1 - t_2) + \frac{1}{96}(581203t_1^2 - 1449550t_1t_2 + 581203t_2^2) \\ &+\frac{23420099(t_1^3 + t_2^3) - 100452495t_1t_2(t_1 - t_2)}{120} + \mathcal{O}(t^4) \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}^{(1,1)} &= -\sum_{i=1}^{2}\frac{7}{1440t_i^2}+\frac{17}{12}+\frac{4133}{36}(t_1-t_2)+\frac{1}{24}(120367t_1^2-342334t_1t_2+120367t_2^2)\\ &\quad+\frac{5206799(t_1^3+t_2^3)-26406615t_1t_2(t_1-t_2)}{30}+\mathcal{O}(t^4) \qquad (2.18)\\ \mathcal{F}^{(0,2)} &= -\sum_{i=1}^{2}\frac{1}{240t_i^2}+\frac{35}{6}(t_1-t_2)t+(338t_1^2-1632t_1t_2+338t_2^2)\\ &\quad+\frac{4}{5}[16533(t_1^3+t_2^3)-151100t_1t_2(t_1-t_2)]+\mathcal{O}(t^4). \qquad (2.19)\end{aligned}$$

The leading terms in $\mathcal{F}^{(n,g)}$ from the non-perturbative contributions are basically the singular terms appearing in integrating out a massless BPS particles in the general graviphoton background near a conifold point in refined topological string theory. We note that there is a $(-1)^n$ factor difference comparing with the convention in [15], probably due to some analytic continuation between these two kinds of calculations.

3 Review of Dijkgraaf-Vafa geometry

Dijkgraaf and Vafa conjectured [8] that the Hermitian matrix model with a degree $n+1$ polynomial potential $W(\Phi)$ is dual to the topological string theory on a local Calabi-Yau three-fold geometry, defined by the following curve on the $\mathbb{C}^4$ coordinates (u,v,y,x)

$$uv = y^2 + W'(x)^2 + f(x), \qquad (3.1)$$

where $f(x)$ is a degree $n-1$ polynomial whose coefficients parametrize the complex structure moduli of the Calabi-Yau geometry. The A-periods of the Calabi-Yau geometry are identified with the filling fractions, i.e. the t'Hooft parameters in large N limit, around the extrema of the potential in the n-cut solution of the matrix model.

We specialize to the case of cubic potential $W(x)$ in (2.3) and introduce some notations. The complex deformation $f(x)$ split the double roots (a_1,a_2) in the equation $W'(x)^2+f(x)=0$, whose roots are denoted as $(a_1^-,a_1^+,a_2^-,a_2^+)\equiv(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4)$. We define the complex parameters

$$z_1=\frac{(x_2-x_1)^2}{4}, \quad z_2=\frac{(x_4-x_3)^2}{4}, \qquad (3.2)$$

which parametrize the complex structure moduli space of the Calabi-Yau geometry. The moduli space and its singular divisors are studied in details in [14]. Here the divisor $z_1z_2=0$ behaves like the conifold divisor. There are two other singular divisors

$$\begin{aligned} I(z_1,z_2) &\equiv \frac{1}{4}[(x_3+x_4)-(x_1+x_2)]^2 = 1-2(z_1+z_2),\\ J(z_1,z_2) &\equiv (x_1-x_3)(x_2-x_3)(x_1-x_4)(x_2-x_4)\\ &= 1-6(z_1+z_2)+9z_1^2+14z_1z_2+9z_2^2, \qquad (3.3)\end{aligned}$$

where the singular divisor $J=0$ also behave like the conifold divisor, and the higher genus topological string amplitudes expended around the divisor t will have gap like behavior [11, 16]. On the other hand, the singular divisor $I = 0$ is actually an essential singularity where the perturbative solutions to the Picard-Fuchs equation have zero radius of convergence.

The planar free energy $\mathcal{F}^{(0)}$ of the matrix model are determined by the well known equation $\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}^{(0)}}{\partial t_i} = \Pi_i$, where the periods are

$$t_i = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{a_i^-}^{a_i^+} \lambda dx, \qquad \Pi_i = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{a_i^+}^{\Lambda} \lambda dx, \tag{3.4}$$

as contour integrals over cycles of x-plane, with the one-form differential $\lambda dx = \sqrt{W'(x)^2 + f(x)}dx$. The expansion for the A-periods to the first few orders are

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 &= \frac{z_1}{4} - \frac{z_1}{8}(2z_1 + 3z_2) - \frac{z_1}{32}(4z_1^2 + 13z_1z_2 + 9z_2^2) + \mathcal{O}(z^4), \\ t_2 &= -\frac{z_2}{4} + \frac{z_2}{8}(2z_2 + 3z_1) + \frac{z_2}{32}(4z_2^2 + 13z_1z_2 + 9z_1^2) + \mathcal{O}(z^4). \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

To compute the period integrals, one finds differential operators $\mathcal{L}(z_1, z_2)$ such that $\mathcal{L}\lambda$ is a total derivative of x variable. One also needs to be careful about possible residua, because of which an operator $\mathcal{L}$ may not annihilate the periods even though $\mathcal{L}\lambda$ is a total derivative [14]. More precisely, up to the second order differentials, there are three linearly independent operators whose actions on λ are total derivatives, which are the followings

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1 &= [(3 - 2z_1 - 6z_2)\partial_{z_1} - 2z_1(1 - 2z_1 - 6z_2)\partial_{z_1}^2 + (z_1 \leftrightarrow z_2)] \\ &\quad +2(1 - 5z_1 - 5z_2 + 6z_1^2 + 4z_1z_2 + 6z_2^2)\partial_{z_1}\partial_{z_2}, \\ \mathcal{L}_2 &= -6 + 36(z_1 + z_2) - 6(9z_1^2 + 14z_1z_2 + 9z_2^2) + 2(z_1 + z_2)[-1 + 6z_1 + 6z_2 - 11z_1^2 - 10z_1z_2 \\ &\quad -11z_2^2 + 6(z_1 - z_2)^2(z_1 + z_2)]\partial_{z_1}\partial_{z_2} + [(7z_1 - 3z_2 - 39z_1^2 - 18z_1z_2 + 9z_2^2 + 46z_1^3 \\ &\quad +62z_1^2z_2 + 26z_1z_2^2 - 6z_2^3)\partial_{z_1} + 2z_1(1 - 6z_1 - 6z_2 + 13z_1^2 + 14z_1z_2 + 5z_2^2 - 10z_1^3 \\ &\quad -6z_1^2z_2 + 10z_1z_2^2 + 6z_2^3)\partial_{z_1}^2 + (z_1 \leftrightarrow z_2)], \\ \mathcal{L}_3 &= [(5z_1 + 3z_2)\partial_{z_1} + 2z_1(2 - 5z_1 - 3z_2)\partial_{z_1}^2 - (z_1 \leftrightarrow z_2)] \\ &\quad -2(z_1 - z_2)(1 - 3z_1 - 3z_2)\partial_{z_1}\partial_{z_2} \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

All three operators annihilate the A-periods t_i. After adding proper constants from regularizing the integrals, the B-periods Π_i can be annihilated by the operators $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$, but not by $\mathcal{L}_3$.

The three point couplings are rational functions of z_1, z_2, and have been computed in [14]

$$\begin{aligned} C_{z_1,z_1,z_1} &= \frac{1 - (6z_1 + 5z_2) + 3(3z_1^2 + 3z_1z_2 + 2z_2^2)}{16I(z_1, z_2)}, \\ C_{z_1,z_1,z_2} &= \frac{1 - 3z_1 - 5z_2}{16I(z_1, z_2)}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

and the others are related by symmetry.

4 Genus one formulae

For the genus one case, we have the following exact formulae from refined topological string

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}^{(0,1)} &= -\frac{1}{2}\log(\det(\frac{\partial t_i}{\partial z_j})) - \frac{1}{12}\log(z_1 z_2) - \frac{1}{4}\log I(z_1,z_2) + \frac{1}{3}\log J(z_1,z_2), \\
\mathcal{F}^{(1,0)} &= -\frac{1}{24}\log(z_1 z_2) - \frac{1}{12}\log J(z_1,z_2),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where I, J are the singular divisors in (3.3). These formulae can be checked perturbatively with the expansions (2.15), (2.16). For the case of $\mathcal{F}^{(0,1)}$ amplitude, the exact formula can be also derived from the loop equation in matrix model [5]. However, the case of $\mathcal{F}^{(1,0)}$ amplitude, which comes from the β-deformation, seems much more challenging to obtained exactly from the matrix model methods.

In [1], the perturbative expansion for $\mathcal{F}^{(1,0)}$ amplitude is used to test the idea of quantum integrability in the Nekrasov-Shatashvili (NS) limit [25, 21]. Here we should follow the method in [12], and check the formula exactly. First we define the deformed periods

$$\tilde{t}_i = \oint_{A_i} \tilde{\lambda} dx, \qquad \tilde{\Pi}_i = \oint_{B_i} \tilde{\lambda} dx, \tag{4.2}$$

where the deformed one-form differential $\tilde{\lambda} dx$ is determined by the quantizing the curve

$$p^2 \Psi(x) = [W'(x)^2 + f(x)]\Psi(x), \tag{4.3}$$

where $\Psi(x) \equiv \exp(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\int^x \tilde{\lambda} dx)$ is a wave function. The canonical quantization relation is imposed so that the operator $p = \epsilon \partial_x$. We can use the WKB expansion of the wave function

$$\tilde{\lambda}(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n(x) \epsilon^n, \tag{4.4}$$

and solve perturbatively for the first few terms as the followings

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lambda(x) \equiv \lambda_0(x) = \sqrt{W'(x)^2 + f(x)}, \\
&\lambda_1(x) = -2\frac{\lambda'(x)}{\lambda(x)}, \qquad \lambda_2(x) = \frac{2\lambda''(x)\lambda(x) - 3\lambda'(x)^2}{8\lambda(x)^3}, \qquad \cdots
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

The odd terms are total derivatives and vanish when integrating over a contour. We are interested in the even term contributions. To compute the contour integrals, we should relate the integrand $\lambda_{2n}(x)$ to the action of some deferential operators on $\lambda(x)$ plus some total derivatives of x. Such a differential operator is found in [1], whose derivatives are with respect to the roots $x_i (i = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ of the quartic equation $W'(x)^2 + f(x) = 0$. Here we should write the operator as derivatives of complex structure parameters z_1, z_2, which is more convenient for calculations. Furthermore, we find that because of the extra Picard-Fuchs operator with non-vanishing residue, the operator is not uniquely determined but is ambiguous by addition of an operator whose action on $\lambda(x)$ is a total derivative.

We consider the differential operator without the constant and the $\partial_{z_1}\partial_{z_2}$ terms, which can be always eliminated using the Picard-Fuchs operators in (3.6). Up to a total derivative denoted as $h_2'(x)$, we find $\lambda_2 = \mathcal{D}_2\lambda + h_2'(x)$, where the operator

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}_2 \;=\;& 1/[6J(z_1,z_2)^3(1-5z_1-5z_2+6z_1^2+4z_1z_2+6z_2^2)]\{[1+12(z_1-z_2)-2(121z_1^2+80z_1z_2 \\
&-25z_2^2)+4(331z_1^3+543z_1^2z_2+229z_1z_2^2-15z_2^3)-(3303z_1^4+8084z_1^3z_2+7978z_1^2z_2^2 \\
&+2772z_1z_2^3+135z_2^4)+16(243z_1^5+756z_1^4z_2+1123z_1^3z_2^2+909z_1^2z_2^3+270z_1z_2^4+27z_2^5) \\
&-12(144z_1^6+525z_1^5z_2+967z_1^4z_2^2+1314z_1^3z_2^3+894z_1^2z_2^4+225z_1z_2^5+27z_2^6)]\partial_{z_1} \\
&+[-1+2(13z_1+7z_2)-2(100z_1^2+141z_1z_2+39z_2^2)+4(169z_1^3+388z_1^2z_2+285z_1z_2^2 \\
&+54z_2^3)-3(353z_1^4+1098z_1^3z_2+1356z_1^2z_2^2+678z_1z_2^3+99z_2^4)+6(105z_1^5+403z_1^4z_2 \\
&+694z_1^3z_2^2+594z_1^2z_2^3+225z_1z_2^4+27z_2^5)]\partial_{z_1}^2\}+(z_1\leftrightarrow z_2). \qquad (4.6)
\end{aligned}$$

There is still an ambiguity due to linear combination of the Picard-Fuchs operators $\mathcal{L}_2$ and $\mathcal{L}_3$. We will consider the NS limit and use the perturbative expansion of $\mathcal{F}^{(1,0)}$ amplitude (2.15), in order to fix the ambiguity. The operator $\mathcal{D}_2$ turns out to be the correct operator which compute the deformed period from the leading term. So we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{t}_i &= t_i + (\mathcal{D}_2 t_i)\epsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^4), \\
\tilde{\Pi}_i &= \Pi_i + (\mathcal{D}_2 \Pi_i)\epsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^4). \qquad (4.7)
\end{aligned}$$

We denote the deformed prepotential in the NS limit as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(0)}(\tilde{t}_i) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}^{(n,0)}(t_i)(\frac{\epsilon}{4})^n, \qquad (4.8)$$

where we use a normalization factor of 4^n for convenience. As in [12] we expand the equation for $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(0)}$ in terms of deformed periods, to derive differential equations for higher genus terms in the NS limit

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \partial_{\tilde{t}_i}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{(0)}(\tilde{t}_i) - \tilde{\Pi}_i \\
&= \partial_{t_i}\mathcal{F}^{(0,0)} - \Pi_i + \epsilon^2[\frac{\partial_{t_i}\mathcal{F}^{(1,0)}}{4} + (\mathcal{D}_2 t_j)(\partial_{t_i}\partial_{t_j}\mathcal{F}^{(0,0)}) - \mathcal{D}_2\Pi_i] + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^4). \qquad (4.9)
\end{aligned}$$

After some algebra, the ϵ^2 order equation can be shown to be equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{4}\partial_{z_i}\mathcal{F}^{(1,0)} = C_{z_iz_jz_k}p_{z_jz_k}, \qquad (4.10)$$

where $C_{z_iz_jz_k}$ are the three-point Yukawa couplings, and $p_{z_jz_k}$ are the coefficients $\partial_{z_j}\partial_{z_k}$ in the differential operator $\mathcal{D}_2$. We check the above equation (4.10) is satisfied exactly, using the three point functions (3.7) and the differential operator $\mathcal{D}_2$ in (4.6).

5 Higher genus

The refined topological string amplitudes at genus $n+g \geq 2$ can be written as polynomials of the propagators $S^{z_iz_j}$ of degrees $2n+3g-3$, with rational functions of complex structure moduli $z_{1,2}$ as coefficients. Here for the local geometry we can set the Kahler potential to be constant and only need the double-index $S^{z_i z_j}$ propagators. The propagators $S^{z_i z_j}$ are defined in [3] by their anti-holomorphic derivative relation with the three point functions, which can be integrated to

$$S^{z_i z_j} C_{z_j z_k z_l} = -\Gamma^{z_i}_{z_k z_l} + f^{z_i}_{z_k z_l}, \tag{5.1}$$

where the $f^{z_i}_{z_k z_l}$ are holomorphic ambiguities from the integration, rational functions of $z_{1,2}$, and have been determined in [14]. The holomorphic derivatives of the propagators form a closed algebra

$$\partial_{z_k} S^{z_i z_j} = C_{z_k z_m z_n} S^{z_i z_m} S^{z_j z_n} - f^{z_i}_{z_k z_m} S^{z_j z_m} - f^{z_j}_{z_k z_m} S^{z_i z_m} + h^{z_i z_j}_{z_k}, \tag{5.2}$$

where $h^{z_i z_j}_{z_k}$ are also rational functions of $z_{1,2}$. We also fix them and find it is sufficient to use $J(z_1, z_2)^3$ as the denominator.

We integrate the refined holomorphic anomaly equation and fix the holomorphic ambiguity by boundary conditions near the singular divisors of the Dijkgraaf-Vafa geometry. Here the ansatz for holomorphic ambiguity at genus g is

$$f_{n,g} = \frac{h_{n,g}(z_1, z_2)}{(z_1 z_2 J^2)^{2g-2}}, \tag{5.3}$$

where $h_{n,g}(z_1, z_2)$ is a symmetric polynomial of z_1 and z_2, and it turns out that for low genus, its degree is lower than $9(n+g-1)$ [16].

To utilize the gap condition near the conifold divisor J, we choose a point on the divisor from its intersection with the line $z_1 = z_2$. Near the point $(z_1, z_2) = (\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8})$, the good local coordinate is

$$z_{c,1} = z_1 - z_2, \quad z_{c,2} = 1 - 4(z_1 + z_2). \tag{5.4}$$

There are 3 power series solutions to the Picard-Fuchs equation near this point

$$\begin{aligned}
w_1 &= z_{c,1}\sqrt{1 + z_{c,2}}, \\
w_2 &= z_{c,2}^2 + 4z_{c,1}^2 z_{c,2} + (4z_{c,1}^4 + 3z_{c,1}^2 z_{c,2}^2 + \frac{3}{32} z_{c,2}^4) + \mathcal{O}(z_c^5), \\
w_3 &= (4z_{c,1}^3 + 3z_{c,1} z_{c,2}^2) + (18z_{c,1}^3 z_{c,2} + \frac{3}{2} z_{c,1} z_{c,2}^3) + \mathcal{O}(z_c^5).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

One choose the first two solutions as the flat coordinates $t_{c,i} = w_i$ near this point [16].

The singular terms of the refined topological string amplitudes expanded near the divisors $z_1 z_2 = 0$ and $J = 0$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}^{(n,g)} &= c^{n,g}\left(\frac{1}{t_1^{2g-2}} + \frac{1}{t_2^{2g-2}}\right) + \mathcal{O}(t_1^0, t_2^0), \\
\mathcal{F}^{(n,g)} &= \frac{(-2)^{11(g-1)} c^{n,g}}{t_{c,2}^{2g-2}} + \mathcal{O}(t_{c,1}^0, t_{c,2}^0).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Here the factor of $(-2)^{11(g-1)}$ is due to a normalization of the flat coordinate $t_{c,2}$, and the constants $c^{n,g}$ appear e.g. in (2.17, 2.18, 2.19) for genus two. These gap conditions (5.6) are sufficient to fix the holomorphic ambiguities, since any non-zero ansatz in (5.3) with $h_{n,g}(z_1, z_2)$ a polynomial of degree less than $12(n + g - 1)$ can not cancel all the poles in the denominators, so would affect the singular terms.

We find the exact refined formulae for the genus 2 amplitudes and check the expansions near the point $(z_1, z_2) = (0, 0)$ agree with the higher order terms from perturbative matrix model calculations in (2.17, 2.18, 2.19). For example, the formula for $\mathcal{F}^{(2,0)}$ is

$$\mathcal{F}^{(2,0)} = \frac{1}{1152 z_1^2 z_2^2 J^2}[a_1^2 S^{z_1 z_1} + 2a_1 a_2 S^{z_1 z_2} + a_2^2 S^{z_2 z_2}] + f_{2,0}, \tag{5.7}$$

Here the coefficients of the propagators are

$$a_1 = 1 - 18z_1 - 6z_2 + 45z_1^2 + 42z_1 z_2 + 9z_2^2, \quad a_2 = a_1(z_1 \leftrightarrow z_2), \tag{5.8}$$

and the holomorphic ambiguity is

$$\begin{aligned} f_{2,0} = {} & \frac{1}{720 z_1^2 z_2^2 J^4}[-(11z_1^2 + 7z_1 z_2 + 11z_2^2) + (231z_1^3 + 389z_1^2 z_2 + \cdots) - (2079z_1^4 + 5547z_1^3 z_2 \\ & +4604z_1^2 z_2^2 + \cdots) + 15(693z_1^5 + 2487z_1^4 z_2 + 2324z_1^3 z_2^2 + \cdots) - 9(3465z_1^6 + 15405z_1^5 z_2 \\ & +19435z_1^4 z_2^2 + 8382z_1^3 z_2^3 + \cdots) + 3(18711z_1^7 + 98037z_1^6 z_2 + 172791z_1^5 z_2^2 + 21757z_1^4 z_2^3 + \cdots) \\ & -3(18711z_1^8 + 111699z_1^7 z_2 + 266274z_1^6 z_2^2 + 50973z_1^5 z_2^3 - 272722z_1^4 z_2^4 + \cdots) \\ & +27(z_1 - z_2)^2(891z_1^7 + 7695z_1^6 z_2 + 32625z_1^5 z_2^2 + 67333z_1^4 z_2^3 + \cdots)], \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

where the $\cdots$ denote the terms implied by the symmetry $z_1 \leftrightarrow z_2$.

Acknowledgments

We thanks Albrecht Klemm for discussions and collaborations on related papers. MH is supported by the "Young Thousand People" plan by the Central Organization Department in China.

References

[1] M. Aganagic, M. C. N. Cheng, R. Dijkgraaf, D. Krefl and C. Vafa, "Quantum Geometry of Refined Topological Strings," JHEP **1211**, 019 (2012) [arXiv:1105.0630 [hep-th]].

[2] G. Akemann, "Higher genus correlators for the Hermitian matrix model with multiple cuts," Nucl. Phys. B **482**, 403 (1996) [hep-th/9606004].

[3] M. Bershadsky, S. Cecotti, H. Ooguri and C. Vafa, "Kodaira-Spencer theory of gravity and exact results for quantum string amplitudes," Commun. Math. Phys. **165**, 311 (1994) [hep-th/9309140].

[4] A. Brini, M. Marino and S. Stevan, "The Uses of the refined matrix model recursion," J. Math. Phys. **52**, 052305 (2011) [arXiv:1010.1210 [hep-th]].

[5] L. Chekhov, “Genus one correlation to multicut matrix model solutions,” Theor. Math. Phys. **141**, 1640 (2004) [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **141**, 358 (2004)] [arXiv:hep-th/0401089].

[6] L. Chekhov and B. Eynard, “Matrix eigenvalue model: Feynman graph technique for all genera,” JHEP **0612**, 026 (2006) [math-ph/0604014].

[7] L. O. Chekhov, B. Eynard and O. Marchal, “Topological expansion of β-ensemble model and quantum algebraic geometry in the sectorwise approach,” Theor. Math. Phys. **166**, 141 (2011) [arXiv:1009.6007 [math-ph]].

[8] R. Dijkgraaf and C. Vafa, “Matrix models, topological strings, and supersymmetric gauge theories,” Nucl. Phys. B **644**, 3 (2002) [hep-th/0206255].

[9] B. Eynard, M. Marino and N. Orantin, “Holomorphic anomaly and matrix models,” JHEP **0706**, 058 (2007) [hep-th/0702110 [HEP-TH]].

[10] B. Eynard and N. Orantin, “Invariants of algebraic curves and topological expansion,” Commun. Num. Theor. Phys. **1**, 347 (2007) [math-ph/0702045].

[11] B. Haghighat, A. Klemm and M. Rauch, “Integrability of the holomorphic anomaly equations,” JHEP **0810**, 097 (2008) [arXiv:0809.1674 [hep-th]].

[12] M. -x. Huang, “On Gauge Theory and Topological String in Nekrasov-Shatashvili Limit,” JHEP **1206**, 152 (2012) [arXiv:1205.3652 [hep-th]].

[13] M. -x. Huang, A. -K. Kashani-Poor and A. Klemm, “The Ω deformed B-model for rigid $\mathcal{N}=2$ theories,” Annales Henri Poincare **14**, 425 (2013) [arXiv:1109.5728 [hep-th]].

[14] M. x. Huang and A. Klemm, “Holomorphic anomaly in gauge theories and matrix models,” JHEP **0709**, 054 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0605195].

[15] M. -x. Huang and A. Klemm, “Direct integration for general Ω backgrounds,” Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **16**, no. 3, 805 (2012) [arXiv:1009.1126 [hep-th]].

[16] A. Klemm, M. Marino and M. Rauch, “Direct Integration and Non-Perturbative Effects in Matrix Models,” JHEP **1010**, 004 (2010) [arXiv:1002.3846 [hep-th]].

[17] A. Klemm, M. Marino and S. Theisen, “Gravitational corrections in supersymmetric gauge theory and matrix models,” JHEP **0303**, 051 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0211216].

[18] D. Krefl and J. Walcher, “Extended Holomorphic Anomaly in Gauge Theory,” Lett. Math. Phys. **95**, 67 (2011) [arXiv:1007.0263 [hep-th]].

[19] D. Krefl and J. Walcher, “Shift versus Extension in Refined Partition Functions,” arXiv:1010.2635 [hep-th].

[20] D. Krefl and J. Walcher, “ABCD of Beta Ensembles and Topological Strings,” JHEP **1211**, 111 (2012) [arXiv:1207.1438 [hep-th]].

[21] A. Mironov and A. Morozov, "Nekrasov Functions and Exact Bohr-Sommerfeld Integrals," JHEP **1004**, 040 (2010) [arXiv:0910.5670 [hep-th]].

[22] A. Mironov, A. Morozov, A. Popolitov and S. .Shakirov, "Resolvents and Seiberg-Witten representation for Gaussian beta-ensemble," Theor. Math. Phys. **171**, 505 (2012) [arXiv:1103.5470 [hep-th]].

[23] A. Morozov and S. Shakirov, "The matrix model version of AGT conjecture and CIV-DV prepotential," JHEP **1008**, 066 (2010) [arXiv:1004.2917 [hep-th]].

[24] N. Nekrasov and A. Okounkov, "Seiberg-Witten theory and random partitions," arXiv:hep-th/0306238.

[25] N. A. Nekrasov and S. L. Shatashvili, "Quantization of Integrable Systems and Four Dimensional Gauge Theories," arXiv:0908.4052 [hep-th].

[26] H. Ooguri and C. Vafa, "World sheet derivation of a large N duality," Nucl. Phys. B **641**, 3 (2002) [hep-th/0205297].